

WILLIE MATTHEWS,
Plaintiff,
v.
CLIFF O'MALLER, et al.,
Defendants.

Matthews seeks reconsideration on the ground that “if I was the judge I would want to hear this case due to how crazy it sound[s]” and “someone should look in to it.” Mot. Reconsider 2. Matthews also asserts that he has “been in prison for al[most] 18 years without being charge[d].”¹ Id. at 3.

Case 5:09-ct-03147-D Document 12 Filed 04/25/11 Page 1 of 3

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) permits a court to alter or amend a judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). The decision to alter or amend a judgment pursuant to Rule 59(e) is within the sound discretion of the district court. See, e.g., Dennis v. Columbia Colleton Med. Ctr., Inc., 290 F.3d 639, 653 (4th Cir. 2002); Hughes v. Bedsole, 48 F.3d 1376, 1382 (4th Cir. 1995). The Fourth Circuit has recognized three reasons for granting a motion to alter or amend a judgment under Rule 59(e): “(1) to accommodate an intervening change in controlling law; (2) to account for new evidence not available [previously]; or (3) to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.” Zinkand v. Brown, 478 F.3d 634, 637 (4th Cir. 2007) (quotation omitted); Bogart v. Chapell, 396 F.3d 548, 555 (4th Cir. 2005); Pac. Ins. Co. v. Am. Nat’l Fire Ins. Co., 148 F.3d 396, 403 (4th Cir. 1998). Matthews has not presented any argument warranting reconsideration, and has cited no recent change in the controlling law, newly discovered evidence, or a clear error that merits an alteration or amendment to the judgment.


Alternatively, to the extent Matthews seeks relief under Rule 60(b)(1) and (3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, his motion also fails. Rule 60(b) authorizes the court to “relieve a party . . . from a final judgment, order, or proceeding for . . . mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect . . . [or] fraud, . . . misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1), (3). Under Rule 60(b), a movant first must demonstrate that the motion is timely, that the movant has a meritorious claim or defense, and that the opposing party will not suffer unfair prejudice by having the judgment set aside. Nat’l Credit Union Admin. Bd. v. Gray, 1 F.3d 262, 264 (4th Cir. 1993); see Augusta Fiberglass Coatings, Inc. v. Fodor Contracting Corp., 843 F.2d 808, 811 (4th Cir. 1988) (per curiam). If those three threshold conditions are met, the court then must determine whether the movant has satisfied “one of the six enumerated grounds for relief under Rule

60(b).” Nat’l Credit Union Admin. Bd., 1 F.3d at 266.

Matthews has failed to establish a meritorious claim or defense. Accordingly, Matthews fails to meet Rule 60(b)’s threshold requirements.

In sum, the court DENIES Matthews’s motion for reconsideration [D.E. 10].

SO ORDERED. This 15 day of April 2011.


JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge